

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

28 November 1978

AM

10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Minutes of October 1978 meeting.
- B. Dates of next meetings: 19 December 1978
23 January 1979
- C. Rosslyn Skyline Status Report.
- D. District of Columbia Historic Preservation Legislation 2-367, Status Report.
- E. District of Columbia Zoning Amendments to Commercial Districts, Report.
- F. Taxicab Commercial Advertising in the District of Columbia Proposed Bill 2-313
- G. Subdivision No. 99, 3593 K Street, N.W. Report on Mayor's Order of 180 Day Delay.

II. LEGISLATION

- A. H.R. 13206, Draza Mihailovich Memorial, Proposal to erect a monument in the environs of the District of Columbia.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

- A. Department of State. Chancellery for Israel, International Center, Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness Street, N.W. Design of new structure.

B. District of Columbia
Department of Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

- a. O.G. 79-13, 1220-22 31st Street, N.W.
RSSN Associates, Ltd., raze shed building.
- b. O.G. 79-17, 1220-22 31st Street, N.W. (rear)
RSSN Associates, Ltd., remove masonry wall/
associated disturbing of earth in preparation
of new construction by adjoining lot.
- c. O.G. 79-18 and 30, 1232 31st Street, N.W. (rear)
RSSN Associates, Ltd., raze building.
- d. O.G. 79-20, 3212 M Street, N.W. (rear)
District of Columbia, raze out-building
at rear of fire house.
- e. O.G. 79-23, 2750 Q Street, N.W.
Dr. and Mrs. Jesse Rubin, add new master
bedroom and guest bedroom wing to existing
residence.
- f. O.G. 79-24, 1023 31st Street, N.W.
Theodore Manousakis, new construction,
raze existing building.
- g. O.G. 79-25, 3222 M Street, N.W.
Georgetown Park Venture, construct three
level enclosed shopping mall, townhouse
and apartment condominium residences and
accessory parking while basically preserv-
ing existing streetscape.
- h. O.G. 79-26, 901 34th Street, N.W.
Donohoe Companies, apartment building
and townhouse.
- i. O.G. 79-29, 3000 M Street, N.W.
Gus Levathes, construction of hotel,
offices and commercial building.

*
✱

- j. Appendix 1

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

- a. S. L. 79-4, 2130 Cathedral Ave., N.W.
Mary Jean Callahan, construction of
new three story residence.
- b. Appendix 2

C. District of Columbia Department
of Housing and Community Development

1. Historic Subdivision Act

- a. H.S. #114, 1611 29th Street, N.W.
Mary Alsop, proposed subdivision
of lot 806 and part of square
1284 into one record lot.

IV. INSPECTION

Georgetown Cases O.G. 79-13, 79-17,
79-18, 79-20, 79-23, 79-24, 79-25,
79-26, 79-29.

* O.G. 79-28, 3200 Grace St., N.W. Renovation and addition to
commercial building, La Maison du Steak, Inc.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

November 28, 1978

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* OG 79-10	1047 31st Street, N.W. Georgetown-Jefferson Associates	Raze building on site.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
* 11	1039 31st Street, N.W. Georgetown-Jefferson Associates	Raze building on site.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
12	2510-12-14 Q Street, N.W. 2512 Association	Renovate apartment building, add lobby.
ACTION:	Issue permit. No objection to proposed changes, suggest use of canopy in front of door.	
14	1015 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Daniel T. Donohoe	Sign
ACTION:	Issue permit for sign centered above doorway.	
15	1517 27th Street, N.W. Francis G. Bittinger	Relocate gate.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
19	1330 30th Street, N.W. Wynant Vanderpool	Construct masonry addition at rear of existing dwelling.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
21	3130 Dumbarton Street, N.W. Mike Morrell	Restoration of original condition at front elevation, fill in 2 openings at side elevation.
ACTION:	Issue permit. Recommend that garage door and small square window above it be blocked with brick panels recessed about 1" from face of building to form blind panels, rather than attempting to tooth-in brick to match. This will retain more of the original/existing historic condition of building.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

November 28, 1978

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
OG 79- 22	3503 M Street, N.W. Mr. Ozzie Clay	Revise proposed elevation with two garage door openings in existing stone wall at M Street to one garage door opening and one masonry opening to vestibule and stair up to first floor.
ACTION: Issue permit.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

November 28, 1978

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
SL 79-1	500 1st Street, N.W. LBJ Restaurant Inc.	Entrance canopy made of steel frame with canvas cover.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	
5	303 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Madison National Bank	Install one single faced sign, metal bronze letters backlighted.
ACTION:	Issue permit.	

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES

28 November 1978

Department of State
Chancellery for Israel

Mr. Lou Bernardo
Mr. Bob Kogod

1023 31st Street, N.W.

Mr. Rousos
Mr. Manousakis

1220-22 31st Street, N.W.

Mr. Stauffer
Mr. Chaing

3222 M Street, N.W.

Mr. Miller
Mr. Rose
Mr. Donohoe
Mr. Lockman

1232 31st Street, N.W.

Mr. Stauffer
Mr. Chaing

901 34th Street, N.W.

Mr. Donohoe
Mr. Lockman

2750 Q Street, N.W.

Mr. Myers

3000 M Street, N.W.

Mr. Wheeler
Mr. Owens

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
28 November 1978

The meeting convened at 10:10 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts office at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:

Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Philip W. Buchen
Hon. Victorine du Pont Homsey
Hon. Eli S. Jacobs
Hon. Frederick D. Nichols

Georgetown Board
Member Present: Mr. Wynant Vanderpool

Staff Present:

	<i>Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary</i>
	<i>Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary</i>
	<i>Mrs. Elizabeth Bemis</i>
	<i>Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson</i>
	<i>Mrs. Sue A. Kohler</i>
	<i>Miss Barbara Tatge</i>

National Capital Planning
Commission Staff Present: Mr. Robert Gresham

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of October 1978 meeting, approved.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 20 December 1978
23 January 1979

C. Rosslyn Skyline Status Report. The Secretary reported that the Interior Department will study the possibility of legal action against the developers of the high-rise projects. The action would be based on inadequate public notice given by the Arlington County Board and on the fact that the impact of these projects on adjacent Federal parkland was not considered. The Chairman noted that through a conversation with the developer for one of the projects, Mr. Stanley Westreich, he had learned that the originally proposed design by the architect Gyo Obata was for a lower structure and that the amount of land available would allow construction of a building which would be less visible but still provide an equal amount of usable space.

D. District of Columbia Historic Preservation Legislation 2-367, Status Report. The Assistant Secretary reported that the second amended version of the bill would be reviewed today by the city council and would probably be approved. In this version, poor people (with the consent of the mayor) would be exempted from provisions of the bill which would normally apply to them. There was some question as to whether the bill

had been granted emergency status, thereby removing it from Congressional review. The Assistant Secretary said he would check on this.

E. District of Columbia Zoning Amendments to Commercial Districts, Report. The Secretary informed the members that the new amendments had downgraded commercial districts from 60 to 50 feet in height, and from an FAR of 2 down to 1.5. He noted that hotels are included in commercial district zoning.

F. Taxicab Commercial Advertising in the District of Columbia, Proposed Bill 2-313. The Secretary said he would read a statement at the hearing on the 29th of November opposing this advertising, in accordance with the Commission's previous directive. EXHIBIT A

G. Subdivision No. 99, 3593 K Street, N.W. Report on Mayor's Order for 180 Day Delay. The Assistant Secretary reported that the Landmarks Committee had supported the Commission of Fine Arts' disapproval of this subdivision and had voted a 180 day delay; this delay has since been accepted by the mayor. EXHIBIT B

II. LEGISLATION

A. H.R. 13206, Draza Mihailovich Memorial, Proposal to Erect a Monument in the Environs of the District of Columbia. The Secretary reminded the members that the Commission had reviewed this legislation some time ago and had no objection at that time. However, he said that the State Department is now opposed to it as being politically unwise. The Chairman and the other members felt that the Commission should defer to the State Department in matters of this nature, and Commission approval of the legislation was withheld.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of State. Chancery for Israel, International Center, Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness Street, N.W. Design of New Structure. The Assistant Secretary explained that this site is on the old Bureau of Standards grounds, south of the Washington Technical Institute, in the International Center complex. Mr. Lou Bernardo from the architectural firm of Cohen and Haft was introduced and discussed his design. He said that it had been determined partially by the topography of the site and by height and setback regulations; additionally, the Israeli Government had requested that it be related in style to the architecture of the Middle East. The building will be for office use only and will eventually contain 51,000 square feet of space. This phase of the construction will provide 36,000 square feet, with an addition planned for the future. Mr. Bernardo said that the material had not been decided on, but would be light in color and possibly brick. The Chairman suggested that he bring in samples for the Commission to inspect; Mr. Bernardo agreed and the design was approved. EXHIBIT C

B. District of Columbia, Department of Economic Development.

1. Old Georgetown Act.

a. O.G. 79-13, 1220-22 31st Street, N.W., RSSN Associates, Ltd., Raze shed building; b. O.G. 79-17, 1220-22 31st Street, N.W. (rear), RSSN Associates, Ltd., remove masonry wall/associated disturbing of earth in preparation for new construction on adjoining lot; c. O.G. 79-18 and 30, 1232 and 1228 31st Street, N.W. (rear), RSSN Associates, Ltd., Raze buildings. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's previous requests in regard to this project (Hamilton Arms Village). These included the preservation of all structures on 31st Street, as much of the ally construction as possible, and retention of the character of the village. He reminded the members that they had also reviewed the design for an alley building to be erected adjacent to the Hamilton Arms property on the east-west alley. At this time the Hamilton Arms developers are requesting demolition permits for the old Reid house in the center of the complex, and alley building, a retaining wall, and a shed containing a kiln. The demolition of the latter two structures is necessary for construction of the other developer's building on the east-west alley as well as for the Hamilton Arms project; part of the shed and wall lie on the other property. The Assistant Secretary noted that the Georgetown Board had no objection to razing these two structures.

The Architect, Richard Stauffer, was introduced. He discussed the scale and character of the project and his effort to maintain it as a village. He said it would continue to be rental property. However, he noted that much of the construction does not conform to codes and several of the dwellings do not have certificates of occupancy. An engineer and a city inspector have examined the buildings for structural soundness and reported many deficiencies. These factors and the lack of parking have posed serious difficulties in keeping the village essentially as it is. At this point, he said, his plan stresses the retention of the present scale and the preservation of the 31st Street buildings. He said the Telephone Company building would most likely be used for offices and probably the alley houses also, because of the difficulty in getting a residential permit for them. The frame house in the center of the property which had belonged to the former owners would be demolished and a reflecting pool put in its place with parking underneath. Existing garden elements would be used around the pool, and the backs of the 31st Street houses would be rebuilt using balconies, as exist at present. He submitted two alternatives for the alley buildings: (1) demolish the first three structures south of the opening into the village and replace them with new construction, or (2) demolish only the first structure south of the opening and replace it. Mr. Stauffer said he had discussed his plan with the neighbors, the Citizens' Association of Georgetown, and the Advisory Neighborhood Council.

Mr. Vanderpool of the Georgetown Board spoke next, saying that the question here is whether Hamilton Arms will remain as a

colorful, enjoyable enclave or be replaced by a new project; Mr. Stauffer's solution represents the new project approach. He acknowledged that this is a very difficult task for an architect, but thought that more effort should be made to keep the village as it is, including retention of all alley structures. The Assistant Secretary noted that Mr. Wright of the Georgetown Board had asked to be put on record supporting Mr. Vanderpool as spokesman for the Board, while also urging the exploration of all possible alternatives, given the badly deteriorating condition of the village.

A number of Georgetown and Hamilton Arms residents stated their views. Deborah Day, a tenant, presented a petition with 800 signatures urging preservation of Hamilton Arms. She said she was not objecting to Mr. Stauffer's plans because they were so bad, but rather because what is now existing is so good. Another resident, Chip Janger, expressed the feeling that there are alternatives between leaving the area in its poorly maintained state and replacing it with new construction. He urged that the gardens be retained and that no demolition take place; he stressed particularly the importance of keeping the Reid's house and the kiln where Molly Reid made the hand decorated tiles which are so important to the character of the village. A neighbor, Gilbert Kinney, felt that hazardous conditions at Hamilton Arms made some renovation imperative; he thought Mr. Stauffer's plans tasteful and sensitive to the preservation of deserving structures. He feared that other developers would be much less inclined towards preservation.

Mr. Grosvenor Chapman of the Citizens' Association of Georgetown said that this organization's desire for preservation did not necessarily rule out this project. He expressed his satisfaction with the preservation of the 31st Street houses and did not object to replacing the alley dwellings with new structures. He questioned what was to be preserved at Hamilton Arms - the Reids or the best part of the architecture.

Mr. Donald Shannon, representing ANC 3A, said he would like to see a final plan before agreeing to any demolition. He also said that he supported Mr. Vanderpool's statement. Mr. Stauffer replied that the plan presented at this meeting is the final plan, the only alternatives being the demolition of one or more alley dwellings. He noted that lack of maintenance has seriously complicated the restoration.

Based on their previous study of the project, the drawings and testimony presented at this meeting, and subject to change after a site inspection, the Commission members determined that no demolition permits would be issued. It was felt that the integrity of the village and its visual character should be preserved, and that this would best be served by finding some means to restore, rather than demolish the Reid house, alley building and kiln. As part of the kiln lies on the adjacent property, it was suggested that this small part could be removed and a new wall constructed on the property line. In regard to the retaining wall, also on both properties, a recommendation was made that it be razed and a new wall erected entirely on Hamilton

Arms property, disturbing the garden as little as possible and using stone from the old wall for the south face. In conclusion the Chairman expressed the Commission's hope that funds would be expended soon to stabilize and preserve all the buildings in the complex before further deterioration takes place. A site inspection following the meeting confirmed the members' decision to disapprove the demolition permits.

EXHIBIT D

d. O.G. 79-20, 3212 M Street, N.W. (rear); District of Columbia, raze out-building at rear of fire house. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the history of the main building, erected in 1796 as the Bank of Columbia and used subsequently as the Georgetown Town Hall before becoming a fire house in 1883. It is listed on the National Register and is a Category II Landmark in the District of Columbia. He noted that the building has been allowed to deteriorate and that the back wall, particularly, is in very poor condition. Mrs. Kohler of the Commission staff reported that the date of the outbuilding is not given in any of the historical documentation, although it appears to have been built soon after the main building was converted to a fire house, judging from the date of its appearance on Washington real estate maps.

Mr. Vanderpool of the Georgetown Board said that even though the outbuilding is in very poor condition it is part of the historical complex and, therefore, should not be demolished. In answer to a question, the Assistant Secretary said that the District Government has given no specific reason for the demolition request. He noted that some underpinning would have to be done when excavation begins for the Georgetown Park project behind this property. Mr. Dinsmoor White, representing the Georgetown Park developers, presented the Commission members with some historical information on the main building. He said that he had been unable to find the outbuilding listed on the District register and remarked that it is presently in very poor condition. The Assistant Secretary thought that the members should make a site inspection before coming to any decision. This was done following the meeting, with the members agreeing that they would have no objection to this demolition but would strongly recommend that the District Government repair the back wall of the main building before further deterioration takes place.

e. O.G. 79-23, 2750 Q Street, N.W., Dr. and Mrs. Jesse Rubin; Add new master bedroom and guest bedroom wing to existing residence. The Assistant Secretary explained that this two-story addition would be built in front on the existing 1 1/2 story structures and would be visible from Q Street. Mr. Vanderpool said the Georgetown Board felt the addition was sympathetic to the other buildings on the property and had approved it. The Chairman expressed some concern about the design of the windows facing Q Street, but as there was no further objection the project was approved.

f. O.G. 79-24, 1023 31st Street, N.W., Theodore Manousakis; New construction raze existing building. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this project, which had been seen before, and reminded the members that they would have to approve the demolition of two stable-garage type structures presently on the property before a building of

the size and type contemplated could be erected. He introduced staff member Sue Kohler who said that although there has been a history of outbuildings of various types on this property since the early 1800's, it would not be possible to give a more precise date than pre-1887 for the stable at the rear. The garage built at right angles to it, extending out to 31st Street, can be dated c. 1900, from its appearance on real estate maps. Mr. Vanderpool said that the Georgetown Board would have no objection to razing both buildings, and the Commission tentatively agreed, pending the outcome of a site inspection following the meeting. Upon inspection, the members voted to support the Board and approved the demolition request.

Mr. William Rousos, the architect, was introduced next and showed the members a completely new design for his building. The core facilities were placed in a tall vertical element to the south, away from the townhouses, so that the mass of the building could be lower and more sympathetic to their scale. The members were not pleased with the new design, particularly with the windowless vertical element, which they thought was not at all in keeping with the Georgetown character. The Chairman told Mr. Rousos that he had not responded to the Commission's previous directions, which were to make some relatively minor changes in the original design. The owner, Mr. Manousakis, asked the Chairman what changes the Commission would like to see, and the Chairman reviewed the previous suggestions regarding adjustments to the cornice line, change in size and appearance of windows, and the reduction of the apparent height through the use of setbacks. The design was not approved.

g. O.G. 79-25, 3222 M Street, N.W., Georgetown Park Venture; Construct three-level enclosed shopping mall, townhouse and apartment condominium residences and accessory parking while basically preserving existing streetscape. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this project, a resubmission, and said that the developers were now at a point where they needed approval for a building permit to start construction. Mr. Herbert Miller, one of the developers, explained through the use of a large model the changes that had been made in the project. He said that the fenestration of the old buildings on M Street had caused some problems and discussed the solution. Mr. Vanderpool said the Georgetown Board was satisfied with the progress and was ready to grant preliminary approval. Mr. Grosvenor Chapman, representing the Citizens' Association of Georgetown and the Advisory Neighborhood Councils, said he was also pleased, although still not happy with the windows on M Street, several of which seemed far too large. He was also critical of the penthouse, as were the Commission members, feeling that it should be restudied in an effort to make it less visible. Mr. Nichols cautioned against breaking up the houses into too many fractured units, and all agreed that the M Street facades needed more study. The members were satisfied that the project had progressed to the point where construction could begin; preliminary approval was granted with the expectations that the design and material of the townhouses, M Street facades and penthouse structures would be reviewed later.

h. O.G. 79-26, 901 34th Street, N.W., Donohoe Companies;

Apartment building and townhouses. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's previous requests on this resubmission, which included the elimination of the blocky appearance of the west elevation of the apartment building and the stepping of the houses along the street and canal, as well as a restudy of the townhouse facades along the Whitehurst Freeway in order to accommodate the supports of that structure. The Georgetown Board has reviewed this new submission, and Mr. Vanderpool reported that it had been approved for design development. Mr. Nichols and the Chairman thought that this submission was, in reality, only a massing study, and that more details need to be seen. On the basis that these would be forthcoming, the project was given preliminary approval.

i. O.G. 79-29, 3000 M Street, N.W., Gus Levathes; Construction of hotel, offices and commercial building. The Secretary reviewed the history of this project, saying that the working drawings had been approved in December 1977. Since that time, however, structural changes have been made, the principal one being the use of a steel rather than concrete frame. On the exterior this has resulted in a change in the window grouping on the south wall. The Secretary also told the members that there has been a zoning change for commercial structures whereby the height limit has been reduced from 60 to 50 feet; whether the new limit would apply to this building is not certain. Mr. Vanderpool said it was the Board's opinion that the Commission should check with the District Government before making any further decisions. The Chairman and the other members agreed. In regard to the window grouping, the Commission found it unsatisfactory and asked Mr. Wheeler, the owner, to submit a revised design with a more regular and symmetrical arrangement. The members also asked to see a wall sample erected on the site before approving the brick selection. Mr. Wheeler agreed, the final approval was deferred pending the outcome of these submissions and the solution of the height limitation questioned.

j. O.G. 79-28, 3200 Grace Street, N.W. Renovation and addition to commercial building, La Maison du Steak, Inc. The Assistant Secretary explained that this submission was only for the confirmation of working drawings. They were approved, and he told the members that a design for the garage door would be seen at a later date.

k. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 79-4, 2130 Cathedral Avenue, N.W., Mary Jean Callahan: Construction of new three story residence. The Assistant Secretary reported that this project would fill in a row of six Georgian-type houses across from the National Zoo. It would be a simple brick structure, similar to existing houses. The members felt that some minor revisions should be made to the facade, and with the provision that the architect consult with the staff on this, the design was approved.

b. Appendix 2, approved.

C. District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Historic Subdivision Act

a. H.S. #114, 1611 29th Street, N.W., Susan Mary Alsop:
Proposed subdivision of lot 806 and part of Square 1284 into one record lot. There was not objection to this subdivision and it was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1 p.m. and the members left for a site inspection in Georgetown.

Signed

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Charles H. Atherton". The script is cursive and somewhat stylized, with the first name "Charles" being more prominent.

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

November 29, 1978

Statement before the
D.C. Committee on Transportation and
Environmental Affairs on Bill 2-313
"Taxicab Commercial Advertising Act of 1978"

Good morning Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. My name is Charles Atherton and I am Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission is delighted to have the opportunity to testify on Bill 2-313, the "Taxicab Commercial Advertising Act of 1978," and appreciates very much your letter inviting us to be here.

As this Committee well knows, the Commission of Fine Arts has had a long standing policy opposing advertising in public space. Most recently the Commission testified against legislation that would have permitted the extensive use of illuminated advertising in public bus shelters, and we are indeed pleased that this law was not enacted by the Council.

The current legislation presents essentially the same problem to the Commission as the previous proposals. Simply put, it means the proliferation of more commercial advertising on the public thoroughfares of Washington. It is our view that each time the door is opened a bit wider to allow outdoor advertising in our Capital in more and varied forms and more places, something is taken away from the unique qualities of our city that quite properly set Washington apart from other commercial urban areas throughout the country.

The landscape and more in particular the streetscape of the District of Columbia has been unusually free of the typical clutter of signs and billboards that all too frequently deface the appearance of so many other American cities. Yet the legislation pending before you today will result in a step in this direction - a step backward I should say.

There are more than 8,000 taxicabs registered in Washington. With double-faced signs mounted conspicuously on the roof tops of each cab, there is the potential here for some 16,000 signs, 14" high and four feet long to be constructed of plastic, I might add, and internally illuminated as well. (Interestingly enough, this was approximately the number of billboards in Washington some seventy years ago before the enactment of the current D.C. sign regulations.) I should point out that these sign regulations do not even permit this type of signage on buildings in certain sections of the city including those special areas adjoining the monumental sections of the Capital such as Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall. Yet Pennsylvania Avenue itself, that special thoroughfare that is a setting for so many important events and frames one of the great views of our most important symbol, the Capitol, will be affected like any other commercial street in the city.

I do not wish to get into the economic aspects of this proposal, since that is a matter that is, strictly speaking, outside the purview of the Commission even though it concerns us; but I do hope they will be studied with as wide a perspective as possible and

an eye toward the future. Whatever the immediate financial benefits to the District may be, I urge the Committee to give most careful consideration to the broader economic view of the Capital, with its immense appeal to the millions of our own citizens and to the ever-increasing number of people from abroad, who come to visit not only because its the Capital but a beautiful city as well.

Each step that tends to make Washington less distinctive and more of a commonplace experience will, we believe, eventually lead to a downturn in one of the city's most critical economic bases; the goal of attracting people to Washington, not only to visit and tour the city, but to permanently locate their businesses and families here as well.

For these reasons, the Commission hopes that the Committee will not act favorably on this legislation. It seems to us that the potential losses exceed the potential gains, and that in the long run, the interests of the people and the Capital will not be well served.

Commission of Fine ArtsStatement by Donald B. MyerAssistant Secretary, Commission of Fine ArtsHearing on 3593 K Street Proposed Subdivision #99November 20, 1978

The Commission of Fine Arts unanimously recommended that the District Government not grant Subdivision Request #99 during its October 24, 1978 meeting and sent the following report:

"The Commission of Fine Arts recommends against this subdivision because of its potential impact through new construction on the tow path of the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. This is one of the most visible portions of the Canal National Park, its landscape and relation to the Georgetown Historic District. Subdivision as proposed gives, as a matter of right, the ability to construct a potentially obtrusive structure on this site which would necessitate removal of the existing tree cover adjacent to the tow path."

As part of its consideration the Commission took into the account the present richly landscaped setting of the tow path, its relationship to and views toward the Potomac River and its screening effect on the closely adjoining elevated Whitehurst Freeway and its connector ramps. Since the C & O Canal has become a historic National Park and Georgetown has become a historic district this site has functioned as a gateway and connecting link between the Canal Park to the west and the more developed sections of the Georgetown waterfront to the east, and as such is an important public amenity.

In making its recommendation, the Commission took into account the Nineteenth Century industrial character of the area and site and its gradual improvement since the early Twentieth Century demolition of the mill and warehouse structures on the site. Photographs and maps show that there were a number of industrial uses including buildings, canal side loading and overhead riverside crane runways on the site. This was all prior to the current recognition, protection and public expectation for this important and scenic portion of one of the most important and historic parks in the Capital.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSFY

KEVIN ROCHI

ILLI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 6, 1978

Dear Mr. Gookin:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Chancery of Israel during its November 28, 1978 meeting, and noted their approval. As we told the architect, the Commission expects to be of further assistance in the matters of reviewing final working drawings and material selection at the convenience of the Embassy and the designers.

I would like to restate one of the Commission's general concerns for the International Center development. One of the amenities of the site itself and to the surrounding community is the wooded edge of the complex as it meets Reno Road and Van Ness Street. We hope that this can be reinforced as a part of each individual construction effort, and that specific landscape designs be a part of each project to this effect.

Sincerely yours,


J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard Gookin
Assistant Chief of Protocol
Department of State, U.S.A.
Washington, D.C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON

December 20, 1978

Dear Mrs. Mason:

Thank you for your letter clearing up the reference to you made in regard to Hamilton Arms at our November 28, 1978 meeting.

I thought at the time that Mr. Looney, who made the statement, was expressing more of a hope than a fact.

We will be happy to set the record straight.

With all best wishes for the holiday.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mrs. Hilda Howland M. Mason
Councilmember at-Large
Council of the District of Columbia
District Building
14th and E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004



COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON D C 20004

HILDA HOWLAND M. MASON
Councilmember at-Large

December 13, 1978

Mr. Charles Atherton
The Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Atherton:

It has come to my attention, through the transcript of testimony given before the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on Tuesday, November 28, 1978, that Mr. Mark Looney (referred to in the transcript as Mr. Rooney) stated, as reported on Page 43, beginning with line 20, that "next week Councilmember Hilda Mason plans to introduce a resolution in the City Council to support preserving all of Hamilton Arms."

Mr. Looney was incorrect in making that statement, and I should like the record to show that. I have never had any plans to introduce before the Council a resolution speaking specifically to the preservation of Hamilton Arms.

I do favor the preservation of Hamilton Arms, and I support citizen efforts to preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods. The distinction that I want to be made clear is that, though I favor the preservation of Hamilton Arms, I had no plans to introduce legislation focused on Hamilton Arms.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Hilda Howland M. Mason".

Hilda Howland M. Mason
Councilmember at-Large

CC: Mark Looney

HHMM:jr

